

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/044,890	HANSEN, SAMUEL N.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Theresa T. Snider	1744	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Theresa T. Snider. (3) _____.

(2) John McGarry. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 April 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4-10, 12-21 and 23-25

Prior art documents discussed:

Hasegawa *et al.* (5,357,649)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called Mr. McGarry to inform him that claims 4-7, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 were in condition for allowance. Examiner informed Mr. McGarry that she indicated claim 11 allowable, in error, and Hasegawa et al. does in fact disclose a pivotal handle (fig. 1, #1a, unlabeled pin attachment). Therefore, amended claim 8, which incorporates claim 11, is still rejectable under Hasegawa et al.. Mr. McGarry suggested inserting the presence of at least one supporting wheel wherein the detector is aligned with and adjacent to the at least one wheel to detect its rotational motion. Mr. McGarry pointed out that Hasegawa et al. has two supporting wheels(5), however the detector(6s) is aligned with a 'sensor' wheel(6) that does not support the apparatus. Though the sensor wheel is contacting the ground, it is mounted on a swing arm(7) that is pivotally mounted to the frame of Hasegawa et al. and therefore structurally would not be able to be considered a 'supporting' wheel. Examiner agreed with this argument. It was agreed that the pivotal handle of former claim 11 would be removed from claim 8 and re-introduced as a dependent claim. Mr. McGarry agreed to change in claim 4, as outlined in the attached Examiner's Amendment, to provide for proper antecedence.